

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成27年度
(第19号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2015

Volume XIX

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2016・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2016

An inscribed Kuṣāṇa Bodhisatva from Vadnagar

Oskar von HINÜBER and Peter SKILLING

The slightly damaged image of a Bodhisatva seated on a *simhāsana*, which is exhibited in the Vadnagar Museum at present, was found near Vadnagar (Gujarat) by a farmer while ploughing his fields.¹ Reading the inscription, which is written in two lines on the pedestal does not pose serious difficulties except for the vowels (figures 1 and 2):

1. *sa(stha)tīya bhikhuniye dāna bodhisattva sagaya cetiyakuṭiye*
2. *āce(r)yana mahāsagh(i)kana pariyaḥ*

TRANSLATION:

In spite of uncertainties in details, the overall message of the inscription is easy to understand:

“Gift of a Bodhisatva by the nun from S(v)ā(m)stha(m)ta (??) for her own *cetiyakuṭi* for the acquisition of the Mahāsāṃghika Teachers.”

COMMENTS ON THE TEXT:

This first word is not clear. A reading *sasthatīya* or even *sāsthātīya* seems likely. Moreover, it is not impossible that an *anusvāra* dot is either missing or lost above the first two syllables. The stone is damaged above the last *akṣara*, and, consequently, it is impossible to decide whether or not the *obliquus* fem. *sasthatīy[e]* is intended as in the following *bhikhuniye*. No dot is visible in the centre of the subscript *-tha-* at the bottom of the *akṣara stha*, which consequently looks like a retroflex *-tha-*. The top of this ligature seems to be damaged. Therefore, neither a reading *sthi* nor *sthām* can be totally ruled out. None of the possible readings (*sā[m]sthā[m]tīy[e]*) or even *svā-*[°] yields any obvious interpretation.

The long *-ā-* in *dāna* is hardly visible. No *anusvāra* is written above *-na*.

Comparing the shape of the *akṣara* read as *-tva-* in the word *bodhisatva* to that of *-ta-* in *sasthatīye* and *-cetiya-*, it seems that *-tva-* rather than *-ta-* is intended by the scribe.

There are two possible segmentations of *bodhisatvasagayacetiyakuṭiye*: either *bodhi-satvasa gaya-*[°] or *bodhisatva sagaya cetiyakuṭiye*. The second segmentation suggested by P. Skilling is much more likely given the parallel formulation *svakāya cetiyakuṭiyā* in inscriptions from Mathurā.² Neither the development *sva-*[°] > *sa-*[°], nor *-ga-* for *-ka-* nor the

¹. We are grateful to Yadubir Singh Rawat (Director, State Archaeology Department, Govt. of Gujarat), for supplying photographs of and information about the image and its inscription.

². H. Lüders: *Mathurā Inscriptions*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen.

short *-a-* in [°]*-gaya* pose any serious difficulty, because all these developments are well attested from Mathurā.³ A parallel to *dānam̄ bodhistva* is found in the Śrāvastī inscription of *bhikṣu* Bala, *EI* VIII. 1905-1906, p. 181, cf. also Lüders § 128.

The vowels *-i-* in [°]*-cetiya-*[°] and *-u-* in [°]*-kuṇiye* are lost.

As the *akṣara -ce-* is certain, if [°]*-cetiya-*[°] is compared, the form *āce(r)yana* is another example of an umlaut⁴ occurring before the cluster *-ry-* and caused by *-y-*. The superscript *-r-* in *-rya-* is uncertain. Moreover, it is impossible to decide whether or not the long *-ā-* of the genitive ending was lost or never written.

The superscript vowels and the final *anusvāra* in the word *mahāsāṃghikānām̄* are not visible and therefore unverifiable.

The last word is *par(i)yaha*, which though clearly legible, should be an erratic writing mistake⁵ for the frequent *parigrahe*. For, there is no explanation for a development of the cluster *-gra-* into *-ya-*. The same would be true, should *-ya-* be a miswritten *-gha-*. This is very unlikely, because the two characters are quite different, when [°]*-saṃghika-*[°] and [°]*-cetiya-*[°] or *āce(r)yana* are compared.

COMMENTARY:

The personal name of the nun, who donated the image, is not mentioned. For, neither is *svāsthatiye* etc. suitable as a personal name for a nun, which should be Sanskrit, nor would the position of the word allow an interpretation as a personal name, because the title *bhikkhunī* (or *bhikkhu*) usually precedes the respective name. Therefore, *svāsthati* etc., which might be derived from *svāsthata* etc., is most likely the place of origin of the nun. If it is a place name, perhaps of only a village, no identification is at hand at present.

The word *cetiyakuṇi* is rare and is so far only attested twice in Mathurā inscriptions in the two donations of Bodhisatva images. The monk Nāgadatta donates one “in the Kaṣṭikīya Vihāra in his own *cetiyakuṇi* (*svakāyam̄ cetiyakuṇiyam̄*)” to the Mahāsāṃghikas (Lüders §

Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge, Nr. 47. Göttingen 1961, § 150, cf. § 157.

³. Theo Damsteegt: *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit*. Leiden 1978 (rev.: M. Mayrhofer, *Sprache* 25. 1979, pp. 176–181; K. R. Norman, *Lingua* 48. 1979, pp. 291–294; J. W. de Jong, *IJ* 22. 1980, pp. 313–316; J. S. Klein, *JAOS* 100. 1980, pp. 150 foll.; G. Fussman, *JAs* 268. 1980, pp. 420–426; W. Rau, *OLZ* 76. 1981, 588–90 = *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 2012, pp. 673–677), p. 16 (*a/ā*); p. 27 foll. (*ka/ga*), p. 89 (*sva > sa*). – If a segmentation *bodhisatvasa gaya-*[°] is preferred, *gayacetiyakuṇi* would be the name of a building, which is rather unlikely.

⁴. O. v. Hinüber: *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 467. Band. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 20. Wien 2001, § 147; further examples are: *aira* in a reliquary from Bajaur (?), 1st century BC: *mahiśadagaṇa airiana parigrahāmi*, G. Fussman *BEFEO* LXXIV. 1985, p. 48 = Keisho Tsukamoto: *A comprehensive study of the Indian Buddhist inscriptions*. Part 1: Text, notes and Japanese translation. Kyoto 1996, V Baj 7; from Mathurā: ... (*a)iryā ma[ḥā](saṅghika)na par(i)[gra]h(e)*, O. v. Hinüber, “The pedestal inscription of Śirika.” *ARIRIAB* XI. 2008, pp. 31–35, particularly p. 34; from Amarāvatī: *sabheriyasa* < *sabhariyasa*, Amarāvatī, Tsukamoto, II Amr 34.2. No corresponding example is quoted in Damsteegt: *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit*, as note 3 above, pp. 23 foll., 73 foll.

⁵. A mistake of a similar type is perhaps *bodhisaco* for *bodhisatvo*, Lüders: *Mathurā Inscriptions*, as note 2 above, § 1. The form *bodhisaco* is neither commented upon by H. Lüders nor listed in Damsteegt: *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit*, as note 3, p. 31, 57. — It might not be totally impossible that *bodhisaco* is not a mistake, but an idiosyncratic Sanskritization of *bodhi-satta*. For, *bodhi-sacca* would correspond to the interpretation of *patteya-buddha* as *pacceka-buddha*, cf. *Mittelindisch*, as note 4 above, § 248 (further *catvara* > **cattara* > *caccara* [?]), see also Th. Oberlies: *Pāli. A Grammar of the Language of the Tipiṭaka*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3. Berlin 2001, p. 96, note 5.

157) and the *upāsikā* Nāgapiyā sets up her Bodhisatva for the Dharmaguptakas also in “her *cetiya*kuṭī (*svakāya catiyāk[u]tiyā*)” without naming the monastery (Lüders § 150). It is not entirely clear what exactly a *cetiya*kuṭī is besides that it is a building in a monastery (§ 157).

According to the evidence found in Theravāda texts, *cetiya*kuṭī, which occurs only once in Pāli, is a synonym of *cetiyaghara*:⁶

kālam karotīti na vijātabhāvapaccayā, āyuparikkhayen’eva. bodhisattena vasitaṭṭhānañ hi cetiyakuṭisadisam hoti, aññesam aparibhogārahām, Sv 436,32–34⁷ = Ps IV 182,1–3

“She (the mother of any Buddha) does not die as a result of giving birth, but because of the exhaustion of her lifespan alone. For any place, in which a Bodhisatva has resided, is like a *cetiya*kuṭī and it must not be used by any others.”

Buddhaghosa’s text is paraphrased by Dhammapāla:

kālam karontīti yathāvutta-āyuparikkhayen’ eva kālam karonti, na vijātapaccayā. carimatta-bhāve hi bodhisattehi vasitaṭṭhānam cetiyaghara-sadisam hoti, na aññesam paribhogārahām, Ud-a 277,29–32

“She (the mother of any Buddha) dies: She dies because of the exhaustion of her lifespan alone as mentioned, not as a result of having given birth. For any place in which Bodhisatvas reside during their final existence is like a *cetiyaghara* and it must not be used by any others.”

The fact that Dhammapāla replaces *cetiya*kuṭī with *cetiyaghara* shows that he considered the two terms to be synonyms. In this context, a *cetiya*kuṭī or *cetiyaghara* is evidently a very small place, which concurs with *cetiyagabbhe ti cetiyaghare cetiyassa abbhantare*, Ps-pṭ II 303,18 “*cetiyagabbha* means a room inside a *cetiya*” as defined in the sub-commentary to the *Papañcasūdanī* on the *Majjhimanikāya*.

Nevertheless, even such a small room was accessible:

cetiyaghare suvaṇṇapadumasuvanṇabubbulākādīni honti, etāni pi anāmāsāni. cetiyaghara-gopakā pana rūpiyachaḍḍakaṭṭhāne ṛhitā, tasmā tesam kelāpayitum vaṭṭati, Sp 543,6–9

“In the *cetiyaghara* there are golden lotus-flowers, small golden stars etc.,⁸ and these as well may not be touched. However, the guards of the *cetiyaghara* hold the position of monks, who dispose of silver (*rūpiyacchadaka*, Vin III 238,24–35), therefore they may handle⁹ (the golden lotus-flowers etc.).”

Moreover, a *cetiyaghara* could also be much larger, because it could be used as a dwelling place:

cetiyagharam bodhigharam āsanagharam sammuñjaniaṭo dāruaṭo vaccakuṭi iṭṭhakasālā vadḍhakisālā dvārakoṭṭhako pānīyamālo maggo pokkharaṇīti etāni hi asenāsanāni, vihāro ...

⁶. The archaeological evidence on *cetiyaghara*s from Ceylon is discussed by Senake Bandaranayake, “Sinhalese Monastic Architecture. The Vihāras of Anurādhapura.” *Studies in South Asian Culture* Volume IV. Leiden 1974, pp. 139–160.

⁷. Neither Sv-pṭ II 35,1–7 nor Ps-pṭ (B^o) II 338,20 comment on *cetiya*kuṭisadisam.

⁸. *suvaṇṇabubbulākan ti suvaṇṇatārakan*, Sp-pṭ II 321,5. — Silver lotus-flowers were presented to the Adhālaka Mahācetiya at Kanaganahalli: Maiko Nakanishi & Oskar v. Hinüber, *Kanaganahalli Inscriptions*. Supplement, ARIRIAB XVII.2, Tokyo 2014, p. 30, I.7, plate LX in K. P. Poonacha: *Excavations at Kanaganahalli (Sannati, Dist. Gulbarga, Karnataka)*. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, no. 106. Delhi 2011 [2013].

⁹. *āmasitvā ito c’ito ca sañcāretum*, Vmv I 262,19 ≠ Sp-pṭ II 321,7.

imāni senāsanāni, Sp 1229,18–22; 1231,9 foll., cf. Sp 1167,8–10

“A *cetiya*-house, a *bodhi*-house, an image-house,¹⁰ a broomshed,¹¹ a woodshed, a toilet, a bricklayer’s workshop, a carpenter’s (or: stone mason’s) workshop, a store-room, a water-pavilion,¹² a lane, a lotus pond — these are not suitable as dwellings; a *vihāra* … these are suitable as dwellings.”

Still larger is a *cetiyaghara* as a shelter for an entire Stūpa:

thūpārāme cetiyaghārappamāṇam, Sv 611, 28

“The size of the Cetiyaghara at the Thūpārāma” (An).¹³

Finally, *cetiyagharas* were accessible by means of doorways and doors:

Sace pana tam dvāram puna iṭhakāhi pidahanti, advāram hoti, ... dīghapamukham cetiyagharam hoti. ekam kavāṭam anto, ekam bahi ..., Sp 748,13–16

“If they close this door-opening by bricks, there is no door-opening ... The *cetiyaghara* has a long access way.¹⁴ One door is inside, one outside ...”

This evidence can be supplemented from and confirmed by inscriptions, e.g., from Nāgārjanakonda:¹⁵

... vihāre ... cetiyagharam saptaśaṁtharam sacetiyaṁ savaniyutam kāritaṁ

“... in the monastery ... a *caitya*-hall with a flooring of slabs, with a *cetiya*, provided with all the necessaries was caused to be made,”

or from Nāsik:

abhamtaram ca lenasa cetiyagharo, Tsukamoto III Ns 19.2

“and in the cave a *caitya*-hall.”

Thus the *cetiyakuṭi* mentioned in the inscription could have been a smaller building inside a monastery as in the donation of the monk Nāgadatta, because it the designation °-kuṭi is

^{10.} On *āsana* see O. v. Hinüber, “Buddhistische Mönche als Verwalter ihrer Klöster. Die Entstehung des Begriffs “vārika” in der Tradition der Theravādins.” ZDMG 162. 2012, pp. 373–389, particularly pp. 387–389 and H. Falk, “Small-scale Buddhism,” in: *Devadattīyam. Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*. Welten Süd- und Zentralasiens Band 5. Bern 2012, pp. 491–517: § 5: “Importance of *āsanas*,” pp. 506–508. — Different Buddhist *āsanas* (“authorized dais for preaching:” *uccāsana, sīmhasana, dharmasana*) are discussed by Joseph Walser, “On Buddhists and their chairs,” in: Vincent Eltschinger & Helmut Krasser (eds.), *Scriptural Authority, Reason and Action. Proceedings of a Panel at the 14th World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, September 1st – 5th 2009*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 847. Band. Vienna 2013, pp. 49–70.

^{11.} The meaning “shed, room” is not listed for *aṭṭa* in Pāli dictionaries, cf. however Ralph Lilley Turner: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London 1966, no. 180 *aṭṭa*².

^{12.} An image of a water-pavillion is shown on an image from Kanaganahalli: *Kanaganahalli Inscriptions*, as note 8 above, p. 98, III.2,21 = Poonacha, as note 8 above, plate LV,A.

^{13.} Yang-Gyu An (trsl.): *The Buddha’s Last Days. Buddhaghosa’s Commentary on the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*. Oxford 2003, p. 220 referring to Walpola Rahula: *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Colombo 1956, p. 119 for this type of large building, cf. also Wilhelm Geiger: *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*. Wiesbaden 1986, § 85, p. 95; § 180, p. 190.

^{14.} Cf. *dīghamukhapāsādo* discussed below p. 45 (O. v. Hinüber, “Some Remarks on Technical Terms”).

^{15.} Jean Philippe Vogel, “Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunakonda.” EI 20. 1929/30, pp. 1–37, p. 22 foll. = Tsukamoto, as note 4 above, II. Naga 41.2.

preferred to °-ghara.

Perhaps some of the buildings shown on images from Kanaganahalli can be classified tentatively as *cetiya-ghara* or °-kuṭī, if they are accessible and if a *cetiya* or a reliquary is visible within.¹⁶ First of all, the unusual image showing different types of monastic buildings is instructive (figure 3 = MASI XXXV, B = LV, C).¹⁷ The top line shows from left to right a *cetiya*, a *cetiya-ghara* / °-kuṭī (?), a Bodhi-tree and an āsana (?).¹⁸

The last word of the inscription, *pariyāhe*, if taken as a mistake for *parigrahe*, is usually translated as “in the acceptance of.”¹⁹ This translation presupposes, as H. Lüders suggested, that all donations are made to the *cāturdiśa saṅgha*, but that they are actually accepted by monks of a specific school. This assumption is supported by about thirty inscriptions from Mathurā²⁰ or from an inscription from Nāgārjunakonḍa (not quoted by H. Lüders), which, at the same time, helps to clarify the meaning of *parigraha*.²¹

...khaniyām vihāro ca acariyānām mahisāsakānām suparigahe cātudisaṁ saṅgham udisāya savasatānām hitasukhāṭham ṭhāpitam

“a khaniya and a vihāra were established in the acceptance (J. Ph. Vogel: for the benefit) of the Mahīśāsaka teachers, assigned to the community of monks of the four directions, for the happiness and well-being of all beings.”

The verb *uddisati* (here *udisāya*) is frequently used to assign merit to other persons, e.g., the deceased parents.²² Therefore it seems that, using *uddisati* and *parigaha* side by side might

¹⁶. A building housing a Buddha image in a monastery is called *vihārakuṭī*: Gregory Schopen, “The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Mediaeval Indian Monasteries.” *JIPh* 18. 1990, pp. 181–217 = *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu 1997, pp. 258–289, particularly p. 185 = 263.

¹⁷. To enhance the quality of the reproduction, the fragmentary image Luczanits 38:12-14 showing only the relevant upper part is preferred to the complete image in MASI XXXV, B = LV, C in Poonacha, as note 8 above, cf. also plates CXV, B (= Luczanits 39:41), XXXIII, A (= Luczanits 38:35-37) and XXXIII, C (on the right pilaster) as well as Luczanits 36:37 (not in Poonacha). A *cetiya* can been identified inside the *cetiyaghara* on plates XXXV, B = LV, C and XXXIII, C, while a reliquary is enshrined in the buildings shown on plates CXV, A (?), XXXIII, A and Luczanits 36:37.

¹⁸. A similar āsana from Mathurā is discussed by Johanna Engelberta van Lohuizen de Leeuw: *The “Scythian” Period*. Leiden 1949, p. 158 (fig. 27).

¹⁹. This word is discussed and translated as “(für den Orden in den vier Himmelsgegenden) zur Entgegennahme der ...” by Heinrich Lüders, “Zu und aus den Kharoṣṭhī-Urkunden.” *AO* 18. 1940, pp. 15–49 = *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 1973, pp. 405–439, p. 18 foll. = 408 foll. The ultimate source of this translation may well be Horace Hayman Wilson: *A Glossary of Juridical and Revenue Terms and of Useful Words Occurring in Official Documents of British India*. London 1855 (repr. Islamabad 1985), s.v. *parigraha* “acceptance, taking a present.”

²⁰. Following Gérard Fussman, “La place des *Sukhāvatī-vyūha* dans le bouddhisme indien.” *JAs* 287. 1999, pp. 523–586 = *Choix d’articles*. Paris 2014, pp. 453–516, particularly p. 570 = 500 foll.

²¹. Jean Philippe Vogel, as note 15 above, p. 24 = Tsukamoto, as note 4 above, II. Naga 45.11-13. The meaning of *khaniya* is unknown, J. Ph. Vogel guesses “pillar.” Perhaps a derivation from *khanati* is more likely: “well” or “tank” (?).

²². On the meaning of *ud-diś* in the context of donations Akira Fujimoto, “*Dāna* and *Dakkhina* in the Context of “Offer of Donation”: *dakkhiṇām ādis-*, *dānam uddis-*, etc.” *Buddhist Studies / Bukkyō Kenkyū* 32. 2004, pp. 83–114, cf. also Peter Skilling, “Seeing the preacher as the Teacher: A note on *sāstṛsamjñā*.” ARIRIAB XII. 2009, pp. 73–100, particularly p. 74. — Commenting on *sāṅghiko yan vihārah kintūpanandasya bhikṣor uddiṣṭa iti*, *Śayanāsanavastu* (R. Gnoli 1978) 37,24, G. Schopen, “The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism.” *JABS* 19. 1996, pp. 81–126 = *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu 2004, pp. 219–259 points out: “Upananda does not own the vihāra in question, it has only been ‘assigned’ (*uddiṣṭa*) to him” (p. 92 = 225).

mean in legal that terms the *vihāra* is assigned (*uddisati*) or transferred to the *cātudisa samgha* as the possessor²³ and acquired (*parigaha*) by the Mahīśāsaka teachers as the actual occupants.²⁴

Consequently, the translation suggested by Gregory Schopen²⁵ for *parigrahe* in a similar context in a late Gupta copper-plate grant is to be preferred:

(mayā ... māhāyānikaśākyabhikṣusāntidevam uddiśya) ... °-vihāre anenaivācāryeṇa prati-pādit[e] māhāyānikāvaivarttikabhikṣusamghānām parigrahe ... (ekādaśakhilapāṭakāḥ ... atisrastāḥ)

“(I gave away eleven *pāṭaka* of uncultivated land having assigned it to the Mahāyāna Śākyabhikṣu Śāntideva [as the owner]) ... in the monastery {donated by this very} Teacher (i.e. Śāntideva), which is the property of the community of irreversible Mahāyāna monks [as the occupants].”

The meaning “possession” is also otherwise attested in epigraphy.²⁶

buddhanandisya karakah parigrahaḥ

“The flask, possession (or: property) of Buddhanandi.”

Furthermore, a random look at some Buddhist texts²⁷ shows that the use of *parigraha* in the sense of “possession” is by no means limited to epigraphical texts and helps to elucidate

Indeed, the relevant procedure of “assigning a *vihāra*” to a monk by the *saṃgha*, which is described in the VIIth Samghādisesa, Vin III 156,21–37, has nothing to do with actual ownership: *añño koci sāmiko hoti ... attuddesan ti attano atthāya*, Vin III 156,24–26 “somebody else is the owner ... assigning to himself means for his use.” — Perhaps a similar distinction is made, but expressed differently in inscriptions from Nāsik: *saṃghasa cātudisasa imam leṇam niyātitaṁ data cānena akṣayanivi*, E. Senart, “The Inscriptions in the Caves at Nāsik.” EI VIII 1905–06, pp. 59–96, p. 82, line 1 and p. 90, line 2–4 = Tsukamoto, as note 4 above, III. Nasi 12 and Nasi 17. Here *niyātita* might correspond to *uddiśya* and *data* to *parigrahe*. — On the use of *niryātayati* cf. “Buddhist Texts and Buddhist Images,” p. 17, note 46, in this issue of *ARIRIAB*.

²³. Cf. *cātuddisam saṃgham uddissa vihāram karoti*, DN I 145,11. It is even technically impossible that the *cātuddisa saṃgha* gives up his possession: *vihāram ... abhiyuñjato abhiyogo na rūhati. sabbesam̄ dhurā-nikkhepābhāvato. na h'ettha sabbe cātuddisā bhikkhū dhurānikkhepam karonti*, Sp 339, 36 foll. “Claiming a *vihāra* is not successful, because the responsibility (i.e., ownership) is not laid down by all. For, not all monks of the *saṃgha* of the four directions lay down their ownership.”

²⁴. “«Possession» en effet, «jouissance» si l'on veut, pas «propriété»: en droit, le monastère est propriété du *saṃgha*, c'est-à-dire des moines du monde entier,” G. Fussman, as note 20, p. 571 = 501 and note 102 on *parigraha*.

²⁵. “The Buddha as an Owner of Property,” as note 16 above, p. 185 = 261, *parigrahe* refers to the land donated, not to the monastery. The parts of the sentence not translated by G. Schopen are in parentheses; {} indicates a slight departure from G. Schopen’s translation. The complete text of this inscription is also found in Tsukamoto, as note 4 above, I. Guna 1,3–8.

²⁶. On a sherd found in Kalhua near ancient Vaiśālī *Indian Archaeology. A Review*. 1989/90, p. 13, plate Vb.

²⁷. The term *parigraha* is also used in Kautalya’s *Arthaśāstra*. Though translated in various ways often differing widely, it seems that in all instances “acquisition, possession” is meant, e.g., *bhūmau hiranye vā parigrahaḥ*, 13.3.17 “acquisition in land and money” (“Anspruch” [J. J. Meyer], “share” [K. P. Kangle = P. Olivelle]); *nivedya putrarakṣārtham gūdhasāraparigrahān*, 5.6.46 “indicating hidden precious possessions (to his sons) for the protection of his sons” (“Besitztümer” [J. J. Meyer], “retinue” [K. P. Kangle], “group” [P. Olivelle]); *kutumbinām abhayavanaparigraheśu madhyamam*, 2.26.1 “the middle (fine, if animals are killed) in sanctuaries in the possession of householders” (“aus dem Freiwald zueignen” [J. J. Meyer], “reserved park enclosures” [K. P. Kangle] “enclosed areas” [P. Olivelle with a note p. 566]): The fine (for everybody, not only for *kutumbins*) is lower in privately owned sanctuaries than in those owned by the king. Cf. also 2.6.1; 3.9.1; 12.2.33. In contrast to Kauṭalya, Manu seems to prefer *vitta* (e.g., *Manu-smṛti* X 115) “property.”

the background of the choice of this word in this particular context.²⁸ First, the *Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya* confirms the meaning “possession:”

parigrahavastu. yathoktam kṣetravastu grhavastu iti, Abhidh-k 94,15

“vastu dans le sens de ‘acte de s’approprier’ (*parigraha*), par exemple ‘vastu de champ, vastu de maison’” (L. de La Vallée Poussin, I p. 287);

dravyastrīparigrahābhāvāt, Abhidh-k 256,1

“parce qu’on ni possède en propre ni objet de propriété ni femme” (L. de La Vallée Poussin, III p. 183).

This particular possession is also connected to making merit and donations:

na tad vastūpādātavyam yasmin vastuni nāsyā tyāgacittam utpadyate na tyāgabuddhiḥ kramate. na sa parigrahāḥ parigrahātavyo yasmin parigrahe notsarjanacittam utpādayen na parivāra utpādātavyo yasmin yācanakair yācamānasya parigrahabuddhir utpadyate, Śikṣāsamuccaya (ed. C. Bendall 1902), 21,1 foll.

“One must not take to oneself anything of which one will have no thought of sacrifice, no understanding of sacrifice; no such acquisition is to be acquired as to which he would have not the heart to let go. He must not take articles of which there arises in him, when asked by beggars, the thought of possession.” (C. Bendall & W. H. D. Rouse, 1922, p. 23).

and:

parigrahataḥ kuśalam katamat? yad dānamayena puṇyakriyāvastunā vā śīlamayena vā svargopapattiparigraho vā ādhyoccakulopapattiparigraho vā vyavadānānukūlyaparigraho vā, Abhidharmasamuccaya 22,15 foll.

“What is the wholesome derived from acquisition? The acquisition of a rebirth in heaven or the acquisition of a rebirth in a rich and high family or the acquisition of what is favourable to purification by means of an act of making merit, be it connected to a donation or to right behaviour.”²⁹

These examples demonstrate that *parigraha* is used particularly to designate a possession, if the aspect of acquisition is underlined.³⁰ As such *parigraha* “acquisition as possession” and

²⁸. Widely divergent meanings are listed in Edward Conze: *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature*. Tokyo 1967 s.v. *pari-graha* “grace, gaining, win, helping, assumption” etc.; BHSD gives only “property” listing references exclusively from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. — A very different meaning is attested in a *dhāraṇī* from Gilgit: *paritram parigrahām paripālanam* (3+4+5) “protection” (O. v. Hinüber, “The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research,” in: Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (edd.): *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften, 460. Band. Wien 2014, S. 79–135, p. 105 no. 38b, lines a6–7).

²⁹. *Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asanga*, ed. by Prahlad Pradhan. Visva-Bharati Studies 12. Santiniketan 1950, text as emended by Lambert Schmithausen, “*Kuśala* and *Akuśala*: Reconsidering the Original Meaning of a Basic Pair of Terms of Buddhist Spirituality and Ethics and Its Development up to Early Yogācāra,” in: *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners. The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in: India, East Asia, and Tibet*, ed. by Ulrich Timme Kragh. HOS 75. Cambridge/Mass., 2013, pp. 440–495, p. 463 note 132. — Walpola Rahula: *Le compendium de la doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamucca) d’Asaṅga*. PEFEOL LXXVIII. Paris 1971 [rev.: J. W. de Jong, TP 49. 1973, pp. 339–346 = *Buddhist Studies*. Berkeley 1979, pp. 601–608; L. Schmithausen, WZKS 20. 1976, pp. 111–122] translates here “Qu’est-ce qui est favorable en recevant?” p. 35, but “accompagnatrice” p. 46 = *Abhidharma-s* 28,11 and “la saisie” p. 47 = *Abhidharma-s* 29,8.

³⁰. This is the reason why *parigraha* can be and is in inscriptions very rarely replaced by *pratigraha*, e.g., in the donation made by Nāgapiyā quoted above: *acāryana dharmaguptakāna pratigrahe*, Lüders § 150. In these

dāna / deyadharma “gift” describe the act of a donation from two different perspectives, from that of the donor and from that of the receiver.

Lastly, it should be noted that the syntax is unusual. For, the locative *parigrahe* is to be construed with the substantive *dāna* or *deyadharma*, which often must be supplied, as shown, e.g., in a damaged inscription from Mathurā, where *dāna* is actually mentioned³¹ ... *ayalasa dāna ... ācariyā (mahopadeśakānam ?) ... parigrahe*. Even though a locative is used with the verb *dadāti*,³² this adnominal construction seems to be limited to epigraphic texts.

cases the acceptance of a gift is emphasized, cf. *ghoras tasya pratigrahah*, *Manu-smṛti* IV 86 “to accept a gift from him is a horrendous deed” (P. Olivelle) etc. Both terms, *parigraha* and *pratigraha*, continued to be used in official documents well into the 19th century, see Wilson: *Glossary*, as note 19 above, s. vv.

³¹ Lüders: *Mathurā Inscriptions*, as note 3 above, § 89 in a badly damaged inscription.

³² Th. Oberlies: *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 5. Berlin 2003, p. 352 with further references. — The form *parigrahā[ya]* postulated by D. C. Sircar, *EI XXX* 1953–1954, p. 184, line 3 in a Mathurā inscription does not exist; *parigrahā acariyana* is an obvious mistake for *parigrahe*.